

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

-----X  
ANTON C. PURISIMA,

Plaintiff,

-against-

24 **CIVIL** 8314 (ER)

**JUDGMENT**

KAMALA HARRIS, et al.,

Defendants.  
-----X

It is hereby **ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:** That for the reasons stated in the Court's Order dated November 8, 2024, the court did not grant Plaintiff leave to file this action before granting him leave to proceed in this action IFP, as required by the order issued in Purisima, ECF 1:13-CV-1068, 7. In addition, Plaintiff's claims in this action are frivolous, that is, his allegations are clearly baseless and/or his claims are based on an indisputably meritless legal theory. See, e.g., *Livingston v. Adirondack Beverage Co.*, 141 F.3d 434, 437 (2d Cir. 1998). Thus, it appears that the court granted Plaintiff leave to proceed in this action IFP in error. The Court has therefore vacated the court's November 4, 2024 order granting Plaintiff leave to proceed in this action IFP (ECF 6), denied Plaintiff leave to file this action IFP (ECF 2), and dismissed this action without prejudice. The Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that any appeal from the order would not be taken in good faith and, therefore, IFP status is denied for the purpose of an appeal. See *Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962); accordingly, the case is closed.

**Dated:** New York, New York

November 12, 2024

**DANIEL ORTIZ**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Acting Clerk of Court**

**BY:**

*K. mango*

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Deputy Clerk**